PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR INFORMAL DISCUSSION ONLY

REMARKS

This Response is in response to the final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005. Claims 1-10, 13-21 and 33, 35 and 37-40 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 15, 17, 38 and 39 were amended. Claims 11 and 12 were canceled.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-21, 33, 35 and 37-40 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. The rejection asserts that there is no basis or suggestion of several amended features in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification supports the features in the claims.

Claims 1, 3 and 8 were rejected for reciting "the user to _create_ the rules." The specification supports that claim language, but to rely on another supported term in the specification, the claims now recite "the user to _define_ the rules." This feature is supported by the original specification at least on pages 181, 182 and 185. The specification notes that a "type of user," referred to as a "task librarian," **defines** rules which cause tasks to be placed on task lists. (p. 181, lns. 10-15). The specification also notes that the rules are "established by the task librarian." (p. 182, lns. 22-24). Establish means to create. The specification also states that an interface "allows task librarians 1502 to **define** tasks and the rules that create them." (p. 184, lns. 5-7). Accordingly, the specification supports the recited feature "to _define_ the rules."

9

PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR INFORMAL DISCUSSION ONLY

Claims 1, 3 and 8 were also rejected for reciting "task which is <u>automatically</u>

<u>selected</u>." This feature is supported by the original specification at least on pages

137, 183 and 184. Nonetheless, to use to another equally supported term in the

specification the claim has been amended to recite "<u>automatically generating a task.</u>"

The specification notes that the task engine application runs as a background process

or service with no direct interaction with client applications, and has the main action

of "the **generation of new tasks** in response to externally generated events." (p. 137,

lns. 29-32). In the context of the present specification, running in the background

suggests that the tasks may be generated or selected automatically. Moreover, the

specification expressly discloses that the event processor "enables **automation** based

on an almost limitless number of events and responses that could be defined." (p. 183,

lns. 24-26). The specification describes that "the system **automatically** responds

with appropriate **automated activities like generating tasks.**" (p. 184, lns. 20-21).

Accordingly, the specification supports the recited feature that the tasks are generated

by being automatically generated, as claimed. For the above reasons, the rejections

are respectfully requested to be withdrawn from independent claims 1, 8 and 15, and

from the dependent claims rejected for depending from these claims (i.e., claims 2, 6-

7, 9, 13-14, 16, 18-21 and 37).

Claims 3, 10 and 17 were rejected for reciting "said task is automatically

selected based on the event received from the event queue." The original claims,

summary of the invention and abstract support this recited feature, but for the

PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR INFORMAL DISCUSSION ONLY

"automatically" selected feature. Nonetheless, the claims have been amended to recite an equally supported term that "said task is automatically generated based on the event received from the event queue." The specification discloses that "[e]vents are then received from any source, such as a common event queue. Finally tasks are selected and outputted based on the received events." (p. 6, lns 17-19; abstract). In describing the system response to events, the specification describes that "the system **automatically** responds with appropriate **automated activities like generating tasks**." (p. 184, lns. 20-21). Accordingly, the specification supports this recited feature. For the above reasons, the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn from dependent claims 3, 10, and 17, and from the dependent claim rejected for depending from these claims (i.e., claim 4).

Claims 5 and 38 were rejected for reciting "match the event from the event queue with the predetermined event defined in the rules." This feature is supported by the original claims and specification. Nonetheless, the claim has been amended to recite an equally supported feature from the specification that the system is "adapted to determine claim characteristics and match the claim characteristics to defined tasks." The specification describes that tasks are selected or generated by "matching claim's characteristics to the task defined in the task library 1500." (p. 185, lns. 18-20). For the above reason, the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn from dependent claims 5 and 38, and from the dependent claim rejected for depending from these claims (i.e., claim 33).

11

Application No 09/305,234
Response dated March __, 2006
Response to final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005

PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR INFORMAL DISCUSSION ONLY

Claim 39 was rejected for reciting "match the claim characteristic to a predetermined characteristic defined in the rules." This language has been deleted from the claim. For the above reason, the rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn from dependent claim 39, and from the dependent claim rejected for depending from this claim (i.e., claim 40).

Claim 11 and 12 were rejected. These claims have been canceled. The rejections are therefore moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks and because no other rejections are pending against these claims, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any matters to expedite allowance of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

_____
Marc V. Richards
Registration No. 37,921
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312)321-4200

12